

9



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,706	06/21/1999	SUMIYO OKADA	21.1924/JRB	7969
21171	7590	10/27/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			PRIETO, BEATRIZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Q

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/336,706	OKADA, SUMIYO ET. AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	B. Prieto	2142	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) B. Prieto (Examiner). (3) _____
 (2) J. Strom (Reg. No. 48,702). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 April 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: REDPATH et. al. (US 5,990,887).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Bento Prieto 4/16/04
 Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant request personal interview and faxed agenda accordingly (MPEP 713). A telephonic interview was granted due to examiner's time constraints, applicant requested via agenda that examiner set forth her interpretation to the claimed term "chat network" and "channel" and to further indicate where does the Redpath reference teach a plurality of chat networks, furthermore, possible discuss further amendment to the claims. Examiner noted in response, that the invention describes a chat network as an information exchange systems in which multiple users can txt/rcv messages with each other using the same network and as widely known (page 1, lines 14-20). Multiple users have a common communication area or field (i.e., the same network) by utilizing an IRC protocol to support communication (page 1, lines 20-31). The term common communication fields, "common networks" and "channel" are interchangeable or equivalent as set forth on from the above pages including page 3, lines 7-15. A communication field is defined as a channel where content sent of the channel is displayed on a designated display area (see page 2, lines 14-27). One common field or network for each conversation between two users (see page 2, lines 28-32, which may be interpreted as session). A chat system is the user's terminal (see page 6, lines 16-19). Fig. 2 illustrates a IRC network A and B, wherein the IRC network is defined as a logical network formed in units of services offered to user of the chat system and is different from the physical network (page 7, lines 24-page 8, line 5). A plurality of channels exist as the common communication fields with each IRC network, wherein the "common communication field" is a "channel" (page 8, lines 6-9). Thereby, the terms fields, area, channels and networks clearly defined and used interchangeably, a IRC network ("chat network") is a logical network formed in units of services offered to users of the chat system (i.e. terminal and/or or software) supports the communication between users having a common field, network, area or channel for each conversation by using a predetermined protocol. "Plural chat networks" are services, broadly speaking light of the specification. Redpath teaches a chat communication between chat system 100 & 110 over the Internet, thereby teaching one common field, area, network, or channel for their conversation (col 3/lines 3-13). Further disclosing a chat communication or conversation between the user of a chat system which is sending a message to a plurality of users at their respective chat systems, wherein a typed messaged is sent via a predetermined protocol to a plurality of users (col 3/lines 38-49 Fig. 3 illustrates services offered to the user of the chat system by a chat application). Because Redpath teaches services offered to a user by the chat system, where the chat system supports communication with a plurality of users of a plurality of chat systems, Redpath teaches a plurality of chat networks. In response, applicant characterized the disclosure of the invention as "overloaded" and "confusing", indicating that the definifion of "chat network" as known, e.g. as defined by Googles or any similar tool, is a cluster of autonomous servers providing different services including channels on which communicated messages from a user to another user of the same network is provided, where the communicated messages are displayed on a common channel or field associated with chat network. Applicant indicated that the term "channel" to him is not clear and rather confusing. Examiner indicated that although applicant's definition is noted, it is not supported in the specification and urged applicant to proceed with caution when amending claims with subject matter that is not disclosed or with subject matter setforth as known. The disclosure in examiner's opinion is away from being overloaded because all of the terms discussed above, are clearly defined and extremely broad, removing any confusing. Furthermore it is noted that on the basis of such broad disclosure construction of claims that would overcome the prior art will be a difficult task. Applicant indicated his intentions to amend the claims on the basis of an graphical user interface aspect he believes is the novelty of the invention. No common understanding nor agreement was reached.